Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/576,581	BAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David K. O'Dell	1625
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>pending</u>		
(1) <u>David K. O'Dell</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Mark Nuell</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 30 April 2009	Time: <u>4:00 P.M.</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
/David K. O'Dell/ Examiner, Art Unit 1625	muli aant/Amuli aant/a D	Signature (Signature)
$(A_{\underline{i}})$	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner had apparently misinterpreted the variables Y' and Z. The examiner had intended to restrict upon Y' instead of Z and p as was set forth previously. Rather than issue a new restriction requirement the examiner called Mr. Nuell to explain the descrepancy, clarify the requirement and have the election take place over the phone to advance prosecution. After calling again on May 7, 2009 the applicant agreed to a new restriction which is set forth in the attached action.